

§ 702.22

(c) After each peer reviewer has evaluated each project independently, the panel may be convened to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the project. Each reviewer may then independently re-evaluate each project with appropriate changes made to the written report.

(d) The report of the interim assessment must include any recommendations the peer reviewer may have for improving the recipient's performance.

(e) The report of the final assessment must contain each peer reviewer's evaluative summary of the recipient's performance, from the beginning of the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement to its conclusion.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(F))

§ 702.22 What information does a peer review panel consider for an interim assessment?

(a) Sources of information for the interim assessment must include—

(1) The original request for proposals or grant announcement and the contract proposal or grant application;

(2) Documentation of any changes in the work described in the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement, including reasons for the changes;

(3) Any progress reports delivered to the Department or made available to the public by the recipient;

(4) Examples of products delivered to the Department or made available to the public by the recipient;

(5) Any relevant reports written by OERI staff, including reports of site visits by OERI staff;

(6) Any performance evaluations conducted under the FAR or the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (34 CFR Part 75).

(7) Any relevant information provided by the recipient in response to Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) (Pub. L. 103-62) requirements; and

(8) Any reports from program evaluations commissioned by the Department.

(b) Sources of information for the interim assessment may also include—

(1) A self-assessment, prepared by the recipient, addressing the criteria in § 702.24;

34 CFR Ch. VII (7-1-02 Edition)

(2) One or more site visits by the peer review panel;

(3) One or more oral or written presentations to the panel by the recipient describing its performance; or

(4) Other information about the recipient's performance.

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 1850-0746)

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(F))

§ 702.23 What information does a peer review panel consider for a final assessment?

(a) Sources of information for the final assessment must include—

(1) The original request for proposals or application notice and the contract proposal or grant application, together with documentation of any changes in the work described in the proposal or application, including reasons for the changes;

(2) If consistent with the recipient's contract, grant, or cooperative agreement with OERI, a written report or oral presentation or both by the recipient summarizing its activities and accomplishments;

(3) Any relevant information provided by the recipient in response to Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) (Pub. L. 103-62) requirements;

(4) Any reports from program evaluations commissioned by the Department; and,

(5) Any relevant information provided by the interim assessment.

(b) The final assessment may also include other sources of information, such as one or more of those listed in § 702.22.

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 1850-0746)

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(F))

§ 702.24 What evaluation criteria must be used for performance assessments?

(a) Peer reviewers (and those recipients who conduct self-evaluations) shall use the criteria in paragraph (b) of this section to assess performance and, in case of interim assessments, to

identify areas in which the performance of recipients may need improvement.

(b) The following evaluation criteria are to guide the assessment process undertaken by peer reviewers. The peer reviewers determine the extent to which recipients meet these criteria:

(1) *Implementation and management.* (i) Peer reviewers shall consider the degree to which the recipient has fully executed its program of work. In doing so, peer reviewers shall consider evidence on the extent to which the recipient completes the work described in the approved application or contract, including any approved modifications, in the time period proposed and in an efficient manner.

(ii) In examining the degree of implementation, peer reviewers may also consider evidence on the extent to which—

(A) The recipient implements and utilizes a quality assurance system for its products or services or both; and

(B) The recipient conducts self-assessment or self-evaluation activities, including periodically seeking out independent critiques and evaluations of its work, and uses the results to improve performance.

(2) *Quality.* (i) Peer reviewers shall consider the degree to which the recipient's work approaches or attains professional excellence. In determining quality, peer reviewers shall consider evidence on the extent to which—

(A) The recipient utilizes processes, methods, and techniques appropriate to achieve the goals and objectives for the program of work in the approved application; and

(B) The recipient applies appropriate processes, methods, and techniques in a manner consistent with the highest standards of the profession.

(ii) In determining quality, peer reviewers may also consider the extent to which the recipient conducts a coherent, sustained program of work informed by relevant research.

(3) *Utility.* (i) In determining the utility of the recipient's products or services or both, peer reviewers shall consider evidence on the extent to which the recipient's work (including information, materials, processes, techniques, or activities) is effectively used

by and is useful to its customers in appropriate settings.

(ii) In determining utility, peer reviewers may also consider the extent to which the recipient has received national recognition; e.g., articles in refereed journals and presentations at professional conferences.

(4) *Outcomes and impact.* (i) Peer reviewers shall consider the results of the recipient's work. In examining outcomes and impact, peer reviewers shall consider evidence on the extent to which—

(A) The recipient meets the needs of its customers; and

(B) The recipient's work contributes to the increased knowledge or understanding of educational problems, issues, or effective strategies.

(ii) In examining outcomes and impact, peer reviewers may also consider the extent to which recipients address issues of national significance through its products or services or both.

(c) For National Research and Development Centers, peer reviewers also shall consider evidence on the extent to which recipients meet the following criteria:

(1) *Quality.* (i) The recipient uses a well-conceptualized framework and sound theoretical and methodological tools in conducting professionally rigorous studies; and

(ii) The recipient conducts work of sufficient size, scope, and duration to produce sound guidance for improvement efforts and future research.

(2) *Utility.* The recipient documents, reports, and disseminates its work in ways to facilitate the effective use of its work in appropriately targeted settings.

(3) *Outcomes and impact.* (i) The recipient's work contributes to the development and advancement of theory in the field of study, including its priority area; and

(ii) The recipient addresses issues of national significance through its products or services or both.

(d) For the Regional Educational Laboratories, peer reviewers also shall consider evidence on the extent to which recipients meet the following criteria:

(1) *Quality.* (i) The recipient utilizes a well-conceptualized framework and

§ 702.24

34 CFR Ch. VII (7–1–02 Edition)

sound theoretical and methodological tools in conducting professionally rigorous studies;

(ii) The recipient conducts work of sufficient size, scope, and duration to produce sound guidance for improvement efforts; and

(iii) The recipient's products are well tested and based on sound research.

(2) *Utility.* The recipient documents, reports, and disseminates its work in ways to facilitate its effective use in appropriately targeted settings, particularly in school improvement efforts of States and localities.

(3) *Outcomes and impact.* (i) The recipient assists States and localities to implement comprehensive school improvement strategies through the provision of research-based information (including well-tested models and strategies), materials and assistance; and

(ii) The recipient's work results in widespread access to information regarding research and best practices, particularly within its region.

(e) For Field-Initiated Studies, peer reviewers also shall consider evidence on the extent to which recipients meet the following criteria:

(1) *Implementation and management.* The recipient's work responds to the goals, objectives and mission of the National Institute from which it is funded.

(2) *Quality.* The recipient utilizes a well-conceptualized framework and sound theoretical and methodological tools in conducting professionally rigorous studies.

(3) *Utility.* The recipient documents, reports, and disseminates its work in ways to facilitate its effective use in appropriately targeted settings.

(4) *Outcomes and impact.* (i) The recipient's work contributes to the development and advancement of theory and knowledge in the field of study; and

(ii) The recipient addresses issues of national significance through its products.

(f) For the ERIC Clearinghouses, peer reviewers also shall consider evidence on the extent to which recipients meet the following criteria:

(1) *Quality.* The recipient applies an integrated approach to acquiring and disseminating significant and high-quality educational literature and materials to maintain and enhance the ERIC database.

(2) *Utility.* The recipient contributes to the development of the ERIC database as a source of literature and materials that reflects trends and issues within its scope.

(3) *Outcomes and impact.* (i) The recipient meets the informational and educational needs of its customers through dissemination and outreach approaches and the development of an array of print and non-print materials; and

(ii) The recipient provides national leadership on the use of current computer, networking, and information technology.

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under control number 1850-0746)

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6011(i)(2)(F))